Books lately Printed for Richard Chiſwell.

DR. *Patrioks* Parable of the Pilgrim. The *6th* Edition Corrected.

——Expoſition of the Ten Commandments. *8vo.*

——Private Prayer to be uſed in difficult times.

— Sermon before the Prince of *Orange* at St. *James's*, *20th January*, 1688.

—— Sermon before the Queen at *Whitehall*, *March* 1. 1688.

Dr. *Burnets* Collection of Tracts and Diſcourſes, written after the Diſcovery of the Popiſh Plot, from the years 1678, to 1685. To which is added, A Letter written to Dr. *Burnet*, giving an Account of Cardinal *Pools* Secret Powers. The Hiſtory of the Powder Treaſon, with a Vindication of the Proceedings thereupon. An Impartial Conſideration of the Five Jeſuits Dying Speeches, who were executed for the Popiſh Plot, 1679.

——His Vindication of the Ordinations of the Church of *England*: In which is demonſtrated, that all the Eſſentials of Ordination, according to the Practice of the Primitive and Greek Churches, are ſtill retained in our Church.

——Reflections on the Relation of the Engliſh Reformation, lately Printed at *Oxford*. In two Parts. *4to.*

—— Animadverſions on the Reflections upon Dr. BURNET's Travels. *8o.*

——Reflections on a Paper, intituled his Majeſties Reaſons for withdrawing himſelf from *Rocheſter*.

——An Enquiry into the Preſent State of Affairs, and in particular, whether we owe Allegiance to the King in theſe Circumſtances? And whether we are bound to Treat with Him, and call him back or no?

——A Sermon Preached in St. *James's* Chappel before the Prince of *Orange* 23*d. December*, 1688.

——A Sermon Preached before the Houſe of Commons, 31. *January*, 1688. being the Thankſgiving day for the Deliverance of this Kingdom from Popery and Arbitrary Power.

——His Eighteen Papers relating to the Affairs of Church and State, during the Reign of King *James* the Second. Seventeen whereof were written in *Holland*, and firſt Printed there; the other at *Exeter*, ſoon after the Prince of *Orange*'s Landing in *England*.

——A Letter to Mr. *Thevenot*, Containing a Cenſure of Mr. *Le Grand's* Hiſtory of King *Henry* the *Eighth's* Divorce. To which is added, a Cenſure of Mr. *de Meaux's* Hiſtory of the Variations of the Proteſtant Churches. Together with ſome further Reflections on Mr. *Le Grand*. 1689.

Scriptorum Eccleſiaſticorum Hiſtoria Literaria a Chriſto nato uſque ad Sæculum XIV. *Facili Methodo digeſta. Qua de Vita illorum ac Rebus geſtis, de Secta, Dogmatibus, Elogio, Stylo; de Scriptis genuinis, dubiis, ſuppoſititiis, ineditis, deperditis, Fragmentis; deque variis Operum Editionibus perſpicue agitur. Accedunt Scriptores Gentiles, Chriſtianæ Religionis Oppugnatores; & cujuſvis Sæculi Breviarium. Inſeruntur ſuis locis Veterum aliquot Opuſcula & Fragmenta, tum Græca, tum Latina, hactenus inedita: Præmiſſa denique Prolegomena, quibus plurima ad Antiquitatis Eccleſiaſticæ ſtudium ſpectantia traduntur.* Opus Indicibus neceſſariis inſtructum. Autore *GULIELMO CAVE*, SS. *Theol. Profeſ. Canonico Windeſorienſi. Accedit ab Alia Manu Appendix ab ineunte Sæculo* XIV. *ad Annum uſque* MDXVII. *Fol.* 1689.

Books lately Printed for Richard Chiſwell.

DR. *Patrioks* Parable of the Pilgrim. The *6th* Edition Corrected.

——Expoſition of the Ten Commandments. *8vo.*

——Private Prayer to be uſed in difficult times.

— Sermon before the Prince of *Orange* at St. *James's*, *20th January*, 1688.

—— Sermon before the Queen at *Whitehall*, *March* 1. 1688.

Dr. *Burnets* Collection of Tracts and Diſcourſes, written after the Diſcovery of the Popiſh Plot, from the years 1678, to 1685. To which is added, A Letter written to Dr. *Burnet*, giving an Account of Cardinal *Pools* Secret Powers. The Hiſtory of the Powder Treaſon, with a Vindication of the Proceedings thereupon. An Impartial Conſideration of the Five Jeſuits Dying Speeches, who were executed for the Popiſh Plot, 1679.

——His Vindication of the Ordinations of the Church of *England*: In which is demonſtrated, that all the Eſſentials of Ordination, according to the Practice of the Primitive and Greek Churches, are ſtill retained in our Church.

——Reflections on the Relation of the Engliſh Reformation, lately Printed at *Oxford*. In two Parts. *4to.*

—— Animadverſions on the Reflections upon Dr. BURNET's Travels. *8o.*

——Reflections on a Paper, intituled his Majeſties Reaſons for withdrawing himſelf from *Rocheſter*.

——An Enquiry into the Preſent State of Affairs, and in particular, whether we owe Allegiance to the King in theſe Circumſtances? And whether we are bound to Treat with Him, and call him back or no?

——A Sermon Preached in St. *James's* Chappel before the Prince of *Orange* 23*d. December*, 1688.

——A Sermon Preached before the Houſe of Commons, 31. *January*, 1688. being the Thankſgiving day for the Deliverance of this Kingdom from Popery and Arbitrary Power.

——His Eighteen Papers relating to the Affairs of Church and State, during the Reign of King *James* the Second. Seventeen whereof were written in *Holland*, and firſt Printed there; the other at *Exeter*, ſoon after the Prince of *Orange*'s Landing in *England*.

——A Letter to Mr. *Thevenot*, Containing a Cenſure of Mr. *Le Grand's* Hiſtory of King *Henry* the *Eighth's* Divorce. To which is added, a Cenſure of Mr. *de Meaux's* Hiſtory of the Variations of the Proteſtant Churches. Together with ſome further Reflections on Mr. *Le Grand*. 1689.

Scriptorum Eccleſiaſticorum Hiſtoria Literaria a Chriſto nato uſque ad Sæculum XIV. *Facili Methodo digeſta. Qua de Vita illorum ac Rebus geſtis, de Secta, Dogmatibus, Elogio, Stylo; de Scriptis genuinis, dubiis, ſuppoſititiis, ineditis, deperditis, Fragmentis; deque variis Operum Editionibus perſpicue agitur. Accedunt Scriptores Gentiles, Chriſtianæ Religionis Oppugnatores; & cujuſvis Sæculi Breviarium. Inſeruntur ſuis locis Veterum aliquot Opuſcula & Fragmenta, tum Græca, tum Latina, hactenus inedita: Præmiſſa denique Prolegomena, quibus plurima ad Antiquitatis Eccleſiaſticæ ſtudium ſpectantia traduntur.* Opus Indicibus neceſſariis inſtructum. Autore *GULIELMO CAVE*, SS. *Theol. Profeſ. Canonico Windeſorienſi. Accedit ab Alia Manu Appendix ab ineunte Sæculo* XIV. *ad Annum uſque* MDXVII. *Fol.* 1689.

OF THE

Behaviour of Christians

UNDER

Various Revolutions.

IMPRIMATUR,

April 20: 1693. R. BARKER.

A LETTER TO A FRIEND

CONCERNING THE

Behaviour of Christians

UNDER THE VARIOUS

REVOLUTIONS

OF

STATE-GOVERNMENTS.

By Peter Allix D.D.

LONDON:

Printed, for **Rich, Chiswell** at the *Rose and Crown* in St. *Paul's Church-yard*, MDCXCIII.

A

LETTER

TO A

FRIEND

Concerning the Behaviour of Chriſtians under the various Revolutions of State-Governments.

THE Revolutions that ſo frequently happen in States, may well engage an honeſt man to examine how Chriſtians, and the Church in general, ought to behave themſelves in ſuch kind of Revolutions. I have therefore undertaken to anſwer your deſire, in as clear and perſpicuous a manner, as it is poſſible for me, without making too particular a Reflection upon the preſent change of Government which hath put you upon propoſing this queſtion to me. You deſire to know of me whether it be lawful for a Chriſtian

to

to pray for a Prince whom he takes to be an Uſurper, and how the ancient Chriſtians behaved themſelves in the like Revolutions.

The *Firſt* Point is a queſtion of Right, whether it be unlawful to pray for a Prince, whom we believe to be an Uſurper; ſo, as that all thoſe who are of this Opinion, are obliged to ſeparate themſelves from the Communion of thoſe who believe him to be a lawful Prince: it being impoſſible that thoſe who think they ought to pray for a diſpoſſeſſed Prince, becauſe they conſider him as their lawful Prince, ſhould be preſent at the Prayers that are made for a Prince whom they conſider as an Uſurper. The *ſecond* Point is a matter of Fact, which I might excuſe my ſelf from entring upon; becauſe it is certain that Chriſtians are to order their Lives not by Examples but by Rules. However for your ſatisfaction I will not refuſe to take a a ſhort view of the Behaviour of the Primitive Chriſtians in ſuch kind of Revolutions.

As to the *firſt* Point, I anſwer, That it is not only lawful for a Chriſtian, but that he is alſo obliged in Conſcience to pray for thoſe, who are in poſſeſſion of the Authority of the State wherein he lives, if he hath a mind to obey the Apoſtle St. *Paul*, and to follow the Principles of the Chriſtian Religion. I ſuppoſe that that which is the Duty of every Chriſtian in particular, is the Duty alſo of the Church in general, foraſmuch as the Church is nothing but an Aſſembly of Chriſtians.

Take we a view therefore of the command of the Apoſtle St. *Paul* in his *Firſt* Epiſtle to *Timothy*, *Chap.* 2. *v.* 1, 2, 3, 4. 'I exhort, therefore, that firſt of all, Sup-'plications, Prayers, Interceſſions, and giving Thanks be 'made for all men, for Kings and all that are in Autho-'rity; that we may lead a quiet and peaceable life in all 'Godlineſs and Honeſty. For this is good and acceptable 'in the ſight of God our Saviour; who will have all men

'to

'to be sav'd, and to come unto the Knowledge of the 'Truth. The learned Dr. *Hammond* hath thus paraphrased this Precept. *First*, In the first place therefore I advise thee and all the Bishops under thy Metropolis, that you have constant publick Offices of Devotion, consisting. *First*, Of Supplications for the averting of all hurtful things, Sins and Danger. 2*dly*, Of Prayers for the obtaining of all good things which you want. 3*dly*, Of intercession for others, and 4*thly*, Of Thanksgiving for Mercies already received; and all these not only for your selves, but, in a greater diffusion of your Charity, for all Mankind. 2*dly*, For the Emperors and Rulers of Provinces under them, to whom we owe all our peaceable living in any place, in the exercise of Religion and virtuous Life; and therefore ought in reason to pray and give thanks for them. 3*dly*, For this God under the Gospel approves of, and requires at our hands. 4*thly*, In proportion to the example which he hath given us in himself, who earnestly desires the good of all Mankind, and useth all powerful means to bring them to reform their former wicked Lives, and now to entertain the Gospel. Whence it appears clearly that a Christian, as such, is obliged to offer up unto God publick Prayers for those that are invested with the Sovereign Authority, and that this is a Duty of the Church in general.

And here I desire you to observe two things, the one is that the Apostle St. *Paul* makes no distinction betwixt the lawful Emperors and Usurpers: the other, that he grounds the necessity of these Prayers upon a principle of gratitude and acknowledgment to the Government in general, whosoever they be that administer it, forasmuch as we are beholden to them for the peaceable life we enjoy in the exercise of our Religion and a virtuous Life.

This being thus stated, a Christian can have no further scruple in this point, but only about the question of matter of Fact, *viz.* who those be that are in actual possession of the

the Sovereign Authority? But this is a question which may no less easily be decided by the Rules of the Gospel; in a word, every Christian is obliged to acknowledge him for his lawful Prince, to whom he payeth tribute. This is the Doctrine of our Saviour Jesus Christ, *Mark* xii. and *Luke* xx. the words of the Gospel are as follows; 'And the Chief Priests and the Scribes the same hour sought 'to lay hands on him (but they feared the People) for they 'perceived that he had spoken this Parable against them. 'And they watched him, and sent forth Spies, which 'should feign themselves Just Men, that they might catch 'him in his words, and so might deliver him unto the 'Power and Authority of the Governor. And they asked 'him saying, Master we know that thou sayest and teachest 'rightly; neither acceptest thou the Person of any, but 'teachest the way of God in Truth. Is it lawful for us 'to give Tribute to *Cæsar*, or no? But he perceiving their 'craftiness, said unto them, why tempt ye me? shew me 'a penny: whose Image and Superscription hath it? They 'answered and said, *Cæsars*. And he said unto them, 'Render therefore unto *Cæsar* the things which be *Cæsars*, 'and unto God the things that be God's. And they could 'not take hold of his words before the people; but mar-'velling at his answer held their peace.

For the better understanding of this answer of our Saviour, I shall again make use of an Annotation of the learned Dr. *Hammond* upon the 22 *Chap.* of St. *Matthew*, where he explains what the *Herodians* were, and what gave occasion to our Saviour to make this answer. Of the *Jew* some part, *says he*, acknowledged, and adhered to the *Cesarean* or *Roman* Authority, some part look upon it, as an Usurpation; and of this generally were the *Pharisees*. This difference or controversie was thus occasioned. About one hundred and fifty years before the birth of Christ the Government of *Judea* came into the hands of the *Zelots* or *Maccabees*, among them *Judas Maccabæus* being

being in fear of *Antiochus*, entered into a League with the *Romans*, which continued about ninety years. Then *Hircanus* and *Aristobulus* the Sons of *Alexander* falling into contention for the Kingdom, and the younger Brother *Aristobulus* getting posſeſſion of it, *Hircanus* applied himſelf to the *Romans* for redreſs, and by *Antipater*'s mediation beſought *Pompey* (being then near) to come with an Army to his relief; *Pompey* did ſo, and thereupon beſieged *Jeruſalem*. *Hircanus*'s Party within, ſoon delivered it up; and *Ariſtobulus*'s party retired into that part, where the Temple ſtood, and *Pompey* ſtorm'd the Temple, and took it, and ſo the City came into the *Romans* power, and *Hircanus* was reſtored to the High Prieſthood, and Kingdom of *Judea*, but ſo as to hold (as he obtained) it under the *Romans* protection: which they did (thoſe of them that were of *Hircanus*'s party) by conſent, and not by force, by a choice which the Factions among themſelves put them upon, and by way of dedition, and ſo *Joſephus* plainly ſaith of the *Jews*, that they had made a dedition of themſelves. Mean while they of *Ariſtobulus*'s party lookt upon the *Romans* as Uſurpers, and forcible Poſſeſſors; and thus it continued till our Saviour's time, and at this time ſome of each party, *Phariſees* on one ſide, and *Herodians*, (*i. e.* followers of *Herod*) on the other, came unto Chriſt, meaning to inſnare him in whatſoever he ſaid, and to take advantage either to inflame the *Phariſees* (which were the moſt eminent among the *Jews*) if he ſhould ſay that tribute was to be paid, or to bring him into danger of *Herod* and the *Roman* party, if he ſhould ſay 'twas not to be paid; And though Chriſt's anſwer be punctually in favour of the *Roman* Emperor, eſpecially to thoſe that took the Tribute to be his right, yet in prudence he thought fit to give ſuch an anſwer, as might beſt avoid the oppoſite danger.

After theſe things here alledged you ſee that nothing can be more natural than to form this Argument: Every

Christian is obliged to acknowledge him for his lawful Sovereign, to whom he pays Tribute. This is the expreſs Doctrine of St. *Paul*; therefore every Chriſtian is bound to pray for thoſe that are in Poſſeſſion of the Government, as for their true Sovereigns.

There are but two ways to elude the force of its Argument; for either we muſt maintain that our Saviour argued like a Sophiſter, in going about to perſwade the Jews to own him for their lawful Prince, to whom they were forced to pay Tribute, in caſe it be true, that people may pay Tribute to a Prince, whom they ought not to acknowledge for their lawful Sovereign; or elſe we muſt maintain that St. *Paul* hath engaged Chriſtians in ſin, by commanding them to pray univerſally for thoſe to whom they pay Tribute, though it may be ſuch men are in poſſeſſion of power, and receive Tribute, for whom they ought not to pray. This conſequence is evident and neceſſary, if it be true that the paying of tribute be neither a lawful mark of their Sovereignty, nor a lawful Foundation to pray for them.

But you'll ſay the concluſion of your Argument will lead us to confound a lawful Government with that which is unlawful, an Uſurper with a rightful Sovereign. At this rate of arguing tho' we are convinced in our Conſciences, that ſuch a one is an Uſurper, and ſuch a one our lawful Prince, we are forced according to your Argument to pray for the Uſurper, and againſt our lawful Prince. That is to ſay, according to your ſenſe, we are charged by St. Paul *to commit immoral acts, and are obliged to ſin againſt God, that we may be obedient to St.* Paul. *And this is enough,* ſay you, *to diſcover the Sophiſtry of your Argument.* Why this is the very point, where I would fain have you. The Principle, I oppoſe, is, that it appertains to the Church to judge of the Title of thoſe who are in poſſeſſion of the Government, whether it be a rightful Title, or not; whereas I maintain on the contrary,

contrary, that it doth not in the leaſt belong to the Church, to pronounce concerning the Title of thoſe who are in Poſſeſſion of the Sovereign Authority. It follows from this Principle, that we cannot lawfully pray to God for any but thoſe, whoſe Title to the Sovereignty we own to be rightful: And I maintain, that if this Concluſion, which is drawn from the Principle I oppoſe, be true, it is impoſſible for any Chriſtian Church to ſubſiſt in any State, and that conſequently the Concluſion, as well as the Principle from whence it ſo naturally flows, cannot but be falſe.

I deſire you, Sir, to take notice that I affirm that it doth not belong to a Chriſtian, as ſuch, to examine whether he who hath the power over a Society, poſſeſſeth the ſame by a Juſt Title or by Uſurpation. I acknowledge indeed that it is the right of the Society, and its Repreſentatives to examine this queſtion; but I flatly deny that it belongs to the Church, or to any of the people, conſidered as Chriſtians, to diſcuſs the Titles of their Sovereigns. Chriſtians, in as much as they are Chriſtians, are in a State in the ſame manner as Phyſicians, who in that capacity have nothing to do to meddle with Affairs of State, tho' they may take cognizance of them as they are Citizens. Affairs therefore of State, muſt not be regulated by any but thoſe who are called to the management of them. And foraſmuch as the People are bound to ſubmit themſelves to the reſolution of their Repreſentatives, the Church accordingly is obliged to own him for a lawful Sovereign of the State whom the Managers of the State own for ſuch, by ordaining Tribute to be paid to him, and Prayers to be offer'd up to God for him, *&c.*

This is my Poſition, the Truth whereof I ſhall here ſet forth with a full and convincing evidence.

First, Jesus Christ declared that Tribute ought to be paid to those, whom the greatest part of the Jews lookt upon as Usurpers (I mean the *Roman* Emperors) and who indeed had usurpt the Power, they themselves had formerly enjoy'd.

2*dly*, Our Saviour did plainly suppose, that the prosperity of their Emperors ought publickly to be prayed for in the Temple, as was constantly done, to which the Zealots of the *Jews* opposed themselves; for otherwise he ought rather to have joined himself to these Zealots, and forborn entring into the Temple, in case he had not approved the Prayers there offer'd up for such Governers.

3*dly*, St. *Paul* taught that we are bound to pray for those that have the Authority in their hands, without ever making the least distinction between those that were possest of this Authority by a lawful or unlawful Title. Now where the Law doth not distinguish, it is plain, that neither ought we.

4*thly*, It hath been the constant practice of the Christian Church to pray for those that had the Sovereign Authority, without ever allowing themselves the Liberty to judge of the Validity or Invalidity of the Titles of those, that were in possession thereof. This practice of the Church in all times and in all places is so uncontested a matter of Fact, that we may defie any Person whatever to produce any one single example of a Schism that hath happen'd in the Church, on a pretence like to that on which they have formed one of late, *viz.* where one party of the Church maintain'd that they ought not to pray for a Prince in Possession, because his Title was not lawful, and separated themselves from those that submitted to him that was in Possession.

It is visible that according to the contrary Principle, if the Church had not only a Right to examine the Title of Sovereigns,

Sovereigns, but were also under an obligation so to do for fear of offering displeasing Prayers to his Divine Majesty, in favour of an Usurper, that it was of indispensable necessity for the Apostles to have made an exact draught of Politicks, fram'd according to the Nature and Rights of the Government; which they ought to have transmitted to their Successors in writing. It would have been necessary also in the Church, to instruct the Bishops, and all the Clergy, conformably to this Scheme of Politicks, to the end that they might afterward instruct the Church, and yet we do not find a tittle of all this neither in the New Testament, nor any other Books of Antiquity: Tho' without this so necessary precaution it cannot be imagin'd, but that a vast number of Schismes must have been formed, by occasion of so many Revolutions that have so strangely changed the Face of Governments, from the time of our Saviour to this present. We must therefore of necessity own either that none of the ancient Christians, ever thought of discharging a duty so essential to the Christian Religion, in the most important Acts of Devotion, or that the Christians never believed, that it was their business to examine the Rights of Sovereigns, much less that they were obliged so to do, to the end they might be in condition to offer their prayers to God with a good Conscience.

I have told you, Sir, That the Christian Religion could never have been admitted, or have subsisted in any State, if our Saviour had given another Rule to his Apostles than that which he hath given them. And accordingly I entreat you to consider with your self a little, what would have become of the Christian Religion, if the Church had undertaken to examin the Titles of Sovereigns? Can you believe in good earnest, that ever she would have met with an easie entrance into the World; if it had been known, that those who preached

it,

it, entred into a State with a design and under obligations of examining the Titles of those who govern'd it, and with a design of charging upon the Subjects as their duty an enquiry of this Nature. I am certain that we cannot meet with any thing like this, neither in the Writings of the Apostles, nor in the Writings of the ancient Doctors of the Church, particularly in their Apologies, wherein they have refuted the principal grounds for which the Emperors rejected the Christian Religion and proscribed it. Yea, I am very ready to be so just to those who are of the contrary Opinion as to believe that they would have more Prudence, than to make any such kind of Declaration to the Indians or Chineſe, if they had a mind to go and Preach the Gospel amongst them.

But some, it may be, may be apt to perswade themselves that the profession of the Christian Religion is the rather to be received upon this Condition of engaging *Subjects* to examin the Title of their Soveraigns and the whole *State*. For indeed it may be thought what can be more advantageous to a Society or a Prince, than Souls of so tender a conscience as are unwilling to pray for a *Prince* till they have discuss'd the point whether their Titles be lawful? But yet I know not whether they would have been able to make the Gospel to be Received on those terms. For 1'. It plainly appears that they must have left all those Countries which from Monarchies were newly changed to Common-wealths, or the contrary. *2d.* It appears that they would have been excluded out of any Country where a Prince had been depos'd, and another put in his place; forasmuch as they could not obey the Laws of an usurper, nor own him by praying for him. *3dly.* They must, even in those places where the government appear'd to them lawful, at their first entrance have declar'd, that their true disciples would be always ready to withdraw themselves from under the authority of the government assoon as any change should be made in it contrary to their

their Scheme of a lawful Government, and that they would do their utmoſt endeavonrs, to withdraw from the State all thoſe that could not comply with this Change in the Government. This ſuppoſed, let them judge in how many places they could have got an entrance for the Goſpel, clogg'd with thoſe Conditionals.

But there is ſomething Worſe than all this; for by this jumbling of political Conſiderations about Government with the doctrine of the Goſpel, the Apoſtles would have been Obliged at their firſt entrance to preſent the Governor of the Place a draught of a lawful Government according to their Notion, to the end that the State might Conſider whether this political Scheme, did agree with the Nature of Governnment as it is eſtabliſht amongſt the ſeveral Nations of the World. This is the point whence they ought of neceſſity to have begun the preaching of the Goſpel, for without this Chriſtians could never be perſwaded to offer up their prayers to God for the Governour of a State. In very truth, the Apoſtles would have ſeemed a company of pityful Men, for underſtanding their Commiſſion no better, as having failed to leave us a good and ample inſtruction in this moſt important matter, and which was of ſo great neceſſity, conſidering the vaſt number of Changes and Revolutions that have happened in Governments: whereas inſtead of uſing this exactneſs they have only ſimply and in general commanded us to pray to God for all the Powers ſet over us, but they never daigned to acquaint us either by their conduct or doctrine that this was to be reſtrained onely to ſuch Powers as are lawful. But they will ſay ſince you grant that a Chriſtian and a Citizen are one and the ſame Perſon, under different reſpects, how is it poſſible that after all this you ſhould conceive, that a Citizen, who is perſwaded in his Conſcience that ſuch an one is an Uſurper, may yet as a Chriſtian, pray God for this Uſurper, as if indeed he were his lawful Prince? To this I anſwer

that

that a *Man* who embraceth any Principles contrary to the Constitution of a State, is very much to be pitied, and if besides he be so unhappy as to fill his brain with whimseys without any ground or probability of truth, and takes pains to confirm himself in the same from passages of *Scripture* misapplied, he is still more incurable; because in this case he huggs his error, as supposing it both Honourable and Meritorious. But to answer directly to this difficulty; I say that the Conscience of such a Person is most Visibly Erroneous. For 1. he judgeth in the quality of a Citizen that such an one is an Usurper for whom it is not lawful to pray; because, as he is a Christian, he admits a Doctrin and Principle in Consequence whereof he opposeth himself against the determination of the *State*, which hath manifestly acted and judged according to other *Principles*. If he forms this judgment as he is a Christian, then he attributes to himself a right which God hath never granted to Christians as such, but if he judge thus in the quality of a Citizen and not of a Christian, he violates the laws of a Society which can not subsist if every private Person be permitted to oppose his particular judgment to that of the publick, declared in the most solemn manner imaginable; the delusion of the Conscience of such a Person appears as evident to me as if a Person should have resolved to maintain from *Scripture* as a Doctrine of faith, that the *Sun* goes round the Earth, and in consequence to this Principle should refuse Communion with those that believe the Systeme of *Copernicus*.

I don't believe that those who represent the body of the State are infallible in their judgment, but seeing it is the highest Human Tribunal where these questions which concern the right of those that pretend to the Government can be decided; I assert that if a Citizen hath a judgment opposite to that of the State, either he must acquiesce in the judgment of the State, or he must depart out of it, for

for fear of being made partaker of the punishment which he beleives God may inflict upon a State for an unjust action, but after all there is none but God that can Correct that which he hath reserved to his Government. This is that which Conscience must naturally dictate to a Man who listens to its Suggestions.

This being granted, I say in the 2*d.* place, that they who reason thus and continue in the State, whose Authority they do not acknowledge, do not follow their own principles as they are bound to do: Suppose we therefore that they ought to separate themselves from their brethren; forasmuch as in the quality of Christians they cannot joyn in those Prayers that offend their Morals, are they not as much obliged, in the quality of Citizens to quit a Society, which they suppose to have violated the Fundamental Laws of the State by raising an Usurper to the Throne of the Lawful Prince? The obligation if I be not mistaken is as binding on this hand, as on the other.

This is an ignorant flattering of our selves, to believe that we may lawfully preserve a propriety in our Estates by continuing in a State, which we look upon as being in actual Rebellion against their Soveraign; for it is certain that the possession of the goods we enjoy, as members of the Society, is no further allowed us than as we own the Authority whereby the Society doth subsist. We have no right to them any further than as the Society allows us to enjoy the same, and that we own the Authority of the Rulers of the Society. The propriety we have in our goods is not from a Natural Right, but from a Positive Right, which cannot subsist but in the Society. As soon as we quit a Society, which we do when we disown its Authority, we have no longer any right to our goods, and accordingly *ipso facto* they cease to be ours. And therefore a stranger who is bound by his oath to his own

Prince, can poſſeſs nothing in a forreign State; he hathno leave to trade in a ſtrange Country any further than he ſubmits himſelf to the laws of the Society, and to undergo the puniſhments which the Law inflicts in caſe it appear that he hath violated the Laws of it. This is the Doctrin of St. *Auguſtin* upon St. *John* confirmed by *Yves* of *Chartres*, *Epiſt.* 65. By what right, ſaith he to the Donatiſts, do you keep poſſeſſion of the Lands belonging to the Churches, is it by Divine or Human Right? The Divine Right is contained in the Scriptures, and the Human in the Laws of Kings, whereupon you perceive that whatſoever a Man poſſeſſeth, he poſſeſſeth it by an Human Right; but as to a Divine Right, the Earth is the Lords and the Fulneſs thereof. 'Tis by Human Right that any one ſaith this Land is mine, this Houſe is mine, this Slave is mine. Take away the Right of the Emperor, and who dares ſay this Land is mine, this Houſe is mine, this Slave is mine. Neither do thou ſay, what have you to do with the King; yea what haſt thou to do with this Poſſeſſion? Don't ſay that thy Poſſeſſions are thine for thou haſt renounced Human Right by which onely one poſſeſſeth whatſoever he has, for if theſe things were eſtabliſhed by a Divine Law, it would not be in the Power of the Judges in ſome caſes to judge according to the Rigor of the Laws, and in other caſes more favorably. Nay Sir to reſide onely under any Government, makes a Man ſubject to the ſaid Government *ipſo facto*, for otherwiſe a Stranger could not be juſtly puniſht for being guilty of high Treaſon againſt a Prince whoſe Subject he is not.

I have ſaid thus much to remove a deluſion ſome put upon themſelves in this matter, for want of due Conſideration, imagining that they may lawfully enjoy their Eſtates without owning the Authority of thoſe that Govern the State, and that they ſatisfie their Conſciences by refuſing to pray for them, when indeed they do

do own their Authority, by having recourſe to thoſe *Laws* and Magiſtrates, who ſecure the Enjoyment of their poſſeſſions; the Magiſtrates who Execute the Laws, having no other Authority, but what is derived from thoſe that Actually Govern the State.

Is it not ſtrange, Sir, to ſee Men for the preſerving the poſſeſſion of their Goods to perſwade themſelves, that by their not praying for him whom they look upon to be an Uſurper, they have done enough to ſatisfie their Conſcience? It is every whit as much a Duty to pay tribute to the Higher Powers, and a Duty to which Conſcience Obligeth us (as St. *Paul* expreſſeth it in the 13*th.* of the *Epiſt.* to the *Romans*, *Ver.* 3,4,5,6.) as it is to pray for them; for neither can the Peace of a Nation be kept without Arms, nor Arms maintain'd without *S*alaries, nor *S*alaries of Souldiers without Tribute. Thus *Tacitus* Explains the Juſtice of Tributes.

If therefore you do not believe the Authority to be Lawful, why can you pay Tribute which is exacted to maintain this unlawful Authority? Is not this to imitate the Conſcience of the Jews, whom Our Saviour reproves for having denied the Power and Authority of *Ceſar* at the ſame time when they acknowledged that they paid Tribute to Him? You will ſay we are Active in praying for an unlawful Authority, but we are onely paſſive in paying Tribute, becauſe that Authority forces us thereto by ways we cannot oppoſe, as wanting power ſo to do. See here a ſubtle peice of Divinity: according to theſe Principles when St. *Paul* orders us to pay Tribute to thoſe to whom Tribute is due, he doth not command Subjects to be Active in paying Tribute but onely to be Paſſive by ſuffering it to be taken from them by force. What is the meaning of a Tribute ſave onely a contribution that is raiſed to maintain the Authority

that governs us? Is it not therefore as positive an act of the *Subject* as the Honour he renders to whom Honour is due? But besides, if this answer be satisfactory it hath this little inconvenience, that it furnisheth the *Jews* with an answer to our Saviour's Argument: The *Pharisees* were reduced to silence because they did not conceive it to be a sufficient justification of themselves to say to our Saviour, *Cæsar* forceth the Tribute from us, we are only passive in paying it. Had they been acquainted with this distinction, they would have stopt our Saviour's mouth; without doubt the *Pharisees* were not in any condition to make resistance which obliged them to pay Tribute, but the action of paying Tribute to him whose Authority they disowned, was sufficient to condemn them, which accordingly also put them to silence. Our Saviour is still the same Judge he was formerly with respect to the *Jews*. The Maxime of Jesus Christ is that we must own him for our lawful Sovereign to whom we pay tribute, and who is possest of the Publick Authority, as appears by the Stamp of Current Money.

I know that some may take an occasion to raise a Dispute here, because the learned Dr. *Hammond*, when explains those words of the xiii. of the Epistle to the *Romans*; *Let every Soul be subject to the Higher Powers*, he understands it of Sovereigns that are rightly established and constituted, and of Supream Governours legally placed in that Kingdom. Whence it follows, that we are not bound to pay tribute to those who have none of this Character, Conscience only obliging us to day Tribute to such, who being lawfully constituted, may and ought to be consider'd as God's Ministers. But I desire you to consider. *First*, That according to Dr. *Hammonds* confession, St. *Paul's* design was to oppose the Doctrine of the *Gnosticks*, who believed that a Heathen could have no lawful Authority over Christians, and made the Liberty of the Gospel to consist

conſiſt in this Maxime; according as Dr. *Hammond* explains himſelf on the 8 *verſe* of St. *Judes* Epiſtle. 2*dly*, That the Apoſtle St. *Paul* doth not give any Right, nor impoſe any neceſſity upon every Chriſtian to oppoſe his Judgment to the Sentiment and Determination of the State, about the Right of the Sovereign that is placed on the Throne; but that he hath wholly left it to the Eſtates to determine who are their true and lawful Sovereigns. And that he hath impoſed a neceſſity upon Believers to pay tribute to all thoſe that are owned to be ſuch, as a thing that is their due, foraſmuch as they are the Miniſters of God. For if we conceive the thing otherwiſe; St. *Paul* muſt have engaged the Chriſtians to examine the Title of ſuch as are inveſted with the Government, for to judge whether it were lawful or no, and this even after that the State had owned them as lawful. The *Roman* Senate having Originally had the Right of naming the Emperors, as we ſee by the ſeveral Elections they have made, as well as by thoſe which it hath approved, when the Armies had prevented its choice; and by this means the Chriſtians would have been diſpenſed with from paying tribute to all thoſe who had invaded the Empire, or who had not obtained the Approbation of the Senate, for their Election made by the Army; or elſe would be obliged to perform, without any regard to conſcience, an act whereof the Apoſtle would have Conſcience to be the Principle, as being founded upon an Emanation of the Authority of God himſelf.

I comprize here in a few words the force of St. *Paul*'s reaſoning. St. *Paul* commands Chriſtians to pray for the Soveraign Powers of the State where they live; he orders them to pay the Tributes that are neceſſary to maintain their Domination, and to exerciſe their Authority. He grounds both theſe duties upon the obligation

obligation that lies upon us to wish all possible good to those, who are the Conservators of the Society in which we live, and to contribute to the Safety and Security the Church enjoys under their Protection, so that he supposeth that these two duties with regard to the Sovereign Powers are inseparable. If you cannot in good Conscience pray for the Sovereign Powers, which the Body of the State owns for such, then neither can you in good Conscience pay them any tribute; and on the contrary, if you can in good conscience pay them tribute, which is design'd to maintain their Domination, you may with as good a Conscience pray for their prosperity.

But this, I suppose, is enough, Sir, as to the first Article of the Question you have proposed to me; I have by the by touch'd upon the second; which I am now willing to examin more carefully, because I perceive that Examples often have as great an influence upon the Spirits of men, as the strongest and most decisive Arguments.

To be assured how the Primitive Christians behav'd themselves, who could not but be acquainted with the Practice of the Apostles and their Successors, we need only to take notice of the Terms of their Liturgies: which the learned Dr. *Hammond* hath quoted in his Annotations on the Second Chapter of the first Epistle to *Timothy*. 'Of these four sorts of prayer 'tis affirm'd by St *Chrysostome*, that they were in his time all used in the Church, ἐν καθημερινῇ λατρείᾳ in the daily Service, καὶ τοῦτο, *saith he*, ἴσασιν οἱ μυσταγωγοὶ, καθ' ἑκάστην ἡμέραν γίνεται καὶ ἐν ἑσπέρᾳ καὶ ἐν πρωΐᾳ, *and this is sufficiently known to all the Priests, or those that officiate Morning and Evening*. And so it appears by the Liturgies. The word δεήσεις referring to the larger or lesser Collecta, that in the Litany for deliverance from all the Evils there named, and the other after, in which the Phrase σὲ κυρίε δεόμεθα *we humbly beseech thee*

thee O Father is used, which is for the averting of Evils. The second to the Prayers for Mercy and other Wants. The third to the ἀιτήσεις, wherein the word ἀιτησόμεθα, *let us pray for the whole state of Christ's Church, for Kings,* &c. is inserted. And the fourth to the Solemn Thanksgiving for all men, and to the Hymns sung to the praise of God, and it may be observed that the direction here of praying for Kings, *&c.* is agreeable to that of the *Hebrews, R. Chaninath in Pirche Aboth,* C. 3. S. 2. *Pray for the Peace of the Kingdom, for unless there be fear, men will devour one another alive.* And so when *Petronius* came to set up *Caligula's* Image in the Temple, they that would die rather than that should be done, being asked then whether they would wage War with the Emperor, answered no, but on the other side twice a day they offered Sacrifice for the safety of the Emperor, see *Josephus,* and *Jer.* 29. 7. Accordingly was the Christians practise, as long as the Emperors continued Heathen, praying in their Liturgies ὑπὲρ Βασιλέων for Kings, after when they were Christian, δεόμεθα ὑπὲρ τῶν εὐσεβεστάτων καὶ θεοφυλάκτων Βασιλέων. *We pray thee for our most pious Kings Defenders of God, or of the Faith of Christ,* as it is in St. *Chrysostom's* Liturgy, and that ὑπὲρ κράτους, νίκης, διαμονῆς, εἰρήνης, ὑγείας, σωτηρίας, αὐτῶν, *for their Power, Victory, Continuance, Peace, Health, Safety.* The very things which they prayed for them, when they were yet Gentiles, saith *Tertullian* in *Apoll. sine monitore precamur pro omnibus Imperatoribus vitam illis prolixam, Imperium Securum, domum tutam, exercitus fortes, Senatum fidelem, populum probum, orbem quietum; we pray for a long life to our Emperors, a secure Empire, a safe House, valiant Armies, a faithful Senate, a good People, a quiet World.* This was after done for *Arrian* and heretical Kings, as *Constantius,* παρακαλοῦμεν τὸν θεὸν ὑπὲρ κοινῆς τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν εἰρήνης, ὑπὲρ τῆς κόσμου εὐσταθείας ὑπὲρ Βασιλέων, ὑπὲρ στρατιωτῶν, καὶ συμμάχων, saith *Cyrillus, Cat.* 10. *We beseech God for the common Peace of the Churches,*

for

for the quiet of the World for our Kings, their Souldiers and Auxiliaries. Thus far the learned Doctor.

Accordingly I desire you to take notice: *First*, That this was a set Form, in which nothing might be changed except only the name of him that was raised to the Throne. *2dly*, That it doth not appear by any Record of the Church, that the reading of these Prayers was ever suspended in any case whatsoever. *3dly*, That there never arose any controversie in the Church, about what Emperor they were to pray for, the Church always acknowledging him to be Emperor, who had that title in those places where it was settled: *4thly*, That there never happened any Schism on this account, during all the manifold Revolutions of the Empire. *5thly*, That there never was a Canon of Council made to regulate the Penance that was to be imposed upon those that had prayed for an Usurper, against a lawful Prince. *6thly*, That it doth not appear that ever any Heathen Emperor persecuted the Christians of one Country, for having prayed for him who had usurped the Empire in the places where they lived. *7thly*, We do not find that ever any Christian in his Commentaries upon the Scripture hath taken notice that it was the Belief of the Church that they ought to make a distinction between an Usurper of the Empire, and a lawful Emperor, before they made Prayers for him.

Would you have some examples to evidence to you the Truth of these Observations? *Cassius* in *Syria* revolted against *Marcus Antoninus* the Philosopher, at the Sollicitation of *Faustina* the Emperor's own Wife: and upon the News that was spread abroad, that *Marck Antonine* was dead, he usurped the Absolute Power that had been conferr'd upon him by the Army which was in *Pannonia*: But this news of the Emperor's death being found to be a mistake,

ſtake, he notwithſtanding carried on his pretenſions, and made himſelf to be owned Emperor by the Provinces of *Cilicia*, *Syria*, *Judea*, and *Egypt*. Do you believe, Sir, that the Chriſtians of thoſe Provinces did continue to pray publickly for *Mark Antonine*, and that they refuſed to pray for *Caſſius* in their Publick Service; if they had done ſo, they muſt have expoſed themſelves to the Perſecution of *Caſſius*; or if they did pray publickly for *Caſſius*, they muſt thereby have ſeparated themſelves from the Communion of thoſe Chriſtians who lived under the Empire of *Mark Antonine*. But where do we read that *Caſſius* perſecuted them for not owning his Authority; or that ever they were excommunicated by the other Chriſtians for having prayed for *Caſſius*, who was an Uſurper.

Do not imagin, *Sir*, that *Tertullian* doth oppoſe what I here aſſert, when he ſaith in his Apology, that never any Chriſtians were found to be Caſſians, Albinians, Nigrians, as if the Chriſtians who lived in thoſe Countries where *Caſſius*, and afterwards *Albinus* and *Niger* had revolted, the firſt againſt *Mark Antonine*, and the other two againſt the Emperor *Severus*, had refuſed to pray for theſe Uſurpers, and had always in their publick Service prayed for *Mark Antonine*, and for *Severus*; but his deſign onely was to aſſert, that never any Chriſtians had a hand in theſe Conſpiracies, which were always carried on by Heathens onely. And for the reſt he ſufficiently intimates, that they never concern'd themſelves with examining the Title of thoſe who were in Poſſeſſion of the publick Authority, when he ſaith, ſpeaking in the Name of the Chriſtians; *Nobis nulla res magis aliena, quam Publicæ, Unam omnium agnoſcimus Rempublicam Mundum*; that is, no matters are greater Strangers to us, than thoſe of the Publick; we are not much concern'd for any other Common Wealth beſides the one great Common Wealth of the World.

Do you beleive, Sir, that the Christians of the East prayed for *Aurelian*, whilst they were under the Power of *Zenobia* Wife of the Emperor *Odenat*, whom *Galienus* the Emperor had Associated in the Empire, and whose Rights she maintained in favour of her Children, against *Aurelian*; or that after the Defeat of *Zenobia* by *Aurelian* they refused to pray for him, under pretence that *Zenobia*, and her Children, for whom they had prayed before, had their lives given them by the Emperor? Did not the Fathers of the Council of *Antioch* acknowledge the Authority of *Aurelian*, as soon as he had Vanquisht *Zenobia*, by petitioning that Emperor to drive away *Paulus Samosatensis* from his Episcopal Mansion, which they could not obtain of *Zenobia*, who had supported him in opposition to their former Judgment?

Can you imagin that ever the Christians concern'd themselves to interpose their Judgment in opposition either to the Senate, or the Army, when the Army having nominated an Emperor in the *East*, the Senate nominated another in the *West*? as it happened after the Death of *Aurelian*; and that they pronounced which of these two was the Lawful Emperor, to the end that they might lawfully and of right pray for him, in refusing to pray for the Usurper? Or do you believe that the Christians of *Africa* did not pray for *Alexander*, who had caus'd himself to be proclaim'd Emperor there, or that those of *Rome*, and the dependencies of it, did refuse to pray for *Maxentius* during the five years wherein he possessed the Soveraign Authority there?

For my part I must own, that I cannot conceive, but that, if the Christians had refused to pray for those whom they consider'd as Usurpers, this their refusal would have raised a Persecution against them, from those who had usurped the Empire; or why those who have

have transmitted the Memory of the Martyrs of the Church, have not made mention of any that suffer'd because they refused to pray for an Usurper, being by this means Martyrs, both of Jesus Christ and of the Title of their lawful Emperors. Neither can I any whit better conceive how or by what means the Christians always exactly agreed about the Title of their Emperors, when the People, the Souldiers, and the Senate have been frequently divided in their Sentiments about it. And if ever the Christians were divided in their opinions about this matter, in the several Provinces of their Settlement, how is it that never any Schism happened amongst them; and if ever there were any, how is it that the Ecclesiastical Historiographers, who have given us an account of the several Schisms, have never mention'd any that was occasion'd upon this account?

If you suppose that the Christians were in so obscure a condition before *Constantine*, that the Heathen Emperors did not mind their Prayers, provided they did but pay their Tribute, and that accordingly they might pray for the lawful Emperors, under the Noses of the Usurpers: at least you cannot imagine any such thing to have been since 333. when *Constantine* had brought the Pagan Religion to truckle under the Christian, and had given the Christians all the advantage of a Publick Worship. After that the Emperor *Constantius* was killed, *Magnentius* made himself the Master of the *Gaules* in *Illyria*; *Vetranio* takes to himself the Imperial Purple; *Nepotianus* causeth himself to be proclaim'd *Augustus* at *Rome*, and twenty eight days after his Coronation was defeated by the Army of *Magnentius*, by which means *Magnentius*, continued Master of *Africa*, *Italy*, and the *Gaules*: Do we read any where that the Bishops of the *Gaules*, *Italy* or *Africa* ever refused during the three years of the Reign of *Magnentius* to pray for him? When *Julian*, took upon him

the Purple in the *Gaules* in 360. in spite of *Constantius*, did the Bishops of the *Gaules* thereupon refuse to pray for him till after the death of *Constantius*? When *Procopius* made himself to be declar'd Emperor at *Constantinople* in 365. do you read that the Christians of *Constantinople* did ever think of refusing to pray for him, or that any were excommunicated for praying for him, during the year of his Reign? When *Eugenius* invaded the *Gaules* after his having killed *Valentinian* the younger, did not the Bishops of the *Gaules* make publick Prayers for *Eugenius* for the space of two years and more? When *Gildo* in the year 396. possest himself of *Africa*, did not the Bishops of *Africa* for a whole year together make any Publick Prayers for him, because forsooth, he was an Usurper? When *Constantius* seized the *Gaules* and *Britain* in 407. and continued in possession of them till 411. did the Bishops of Great *Britain* and the *Gaules* pray all this time for *Honorius*, without praying for *Constantius*? When *Alaric* after he had taken *Rome*, made *Attalus* to be chosen Emperor in 409. did any refuse to pray for him in the Countries under his subjection? When one called *John*, caused himself to be proclaim'd Emperor at *Rome*, and in the *West* against the Emperor *Valentinian* III. can any one shew us that the Christians refused to pray for him, during the year that he was in possession of *Rome*, and divers other Provinces of the *West*?

Should I go about to run over all the History of te Church and Empire, I could every where make it appear, that this was ever the behaviour of the Christians in these cases, but because I am to confine my self within the Bounds of a Letter, I shall tie my self to four Examples, which will be sufficient to make you judge of the rest. The First is taken out of the History of *Constantine* the Great, who oppos'd *Licinius* his Brother in Law and Collegue in the Empire, for no other reason

ſon but to put a ſtop to the Violent Perſecution which *Licinius* had raiſed in the Empire of the *Eaſt*, which was his Part. How did the Chriſtians behave themſelves after that *Licinius* was overcome and forced by *Conſtantine* to betake himſelf to a Private Life, did they refuſe to pray for *Conſtantine* under Pretence that *Licinius* the Father was yet alive? Or did they continue to pray for *Licinius* the Father, or *Licinius* the Son, whom his Father had declar'd *Auguſtus*? I know no body that was capable of ſuch a prepoſterous Behaviour ſave onely *Euſebius* of *Nicomedia*, who had all along been a great Favourer of *Licinius* againſt *Conſtantine*. All the reſt of the Chriſtians were overjoyed at this Revolution, and the Nicene Council bleſſed God for it, and ordered publick Thankſgivings therefore.

See here another Example, which I would deſire you ſeriouſly to conſider. The Emperor *Gratianus* having been aſſaſſinated by Count *Andragalbius*, *Maximus* thereupon invaded *Britain*, the Gauls and *Spain*, and was there proclaimed Emperor. Do you ſuppoſe that the Churches of theſe Three Great Provinces of the Empire of the *Weſt*, did continue to pray for *Valentinian*, whom *Gratian* had aſſociated in the Empire, and that they refus'd to pray for *Maximus*? Or do you imagin that any Schiſm happen'd amongſt the Chriſtians of theſe Three Provinces upon this occaſion? True it is that there happened a Schiſme between the Churches of *France*, the greater part whereof refuſed to communicate with thoſe Biſhops, that had employed the Authority of *Maximus* for the puniſhing of *Priſcillian*, ſo great an Enmity did this Church at that time bear againſt all Perſecution; but we do not read that the other Biſhops divided themſelves, ſome of them thinking themſelves bound to pray for *Valentinian*, and other for *Maximus* the Uſurper. Let any Man read

over

over the Monuments of those times, and he shall no where find any the least instance that the Christians of Great *Britain* did follow any other order in their Prayers, than the Gauls and Spaniards did.

If ever there were a just occasion to refuse to pray for an Emperour, it was then when *Phocas* invaded the Empire and usurped it from *Maurice*. The Barbarous Cruelty which he used towards that Emperour and four of his Children, cannot be read without Sorrow; *Theodosius* the Son of *Maurice*, whom his Father had declared *Augustus*, had escaped the Massacre.

Well, do we find that for all this the Church refused to pray for *Phocas*? They who will read the 38*th*. *Epistle* of the XI. Book of the Pope that then was, may judge whether the Church of *Rome*, in the name whereof *Gregory* writes to *Phocas*, after that his Accession to the Empire had been signifi'd to the Church, and to the *Roman Senate*, made any difficulty to pray for *Phocas*, whom all Succeeding Posterity have consider'd as a great Tyrant.

I could easily make it appear that the same Maximes have been followed by all the Kingdoms of the *West*, which were raised from the Ruins of the *Roman* Empire; but it will be sufficient to alledge onely the Example of *France*.

Some years since a great Question hath been started between Father *le Cointe*, and the Doctors of the Court of *Rome*. The latter contending that the *Franks* did not deprive King *Childeric* of the Royal Title, but by the concurring Authority of Pope *Zachary*; whereas Father *le Cointe* rejects this opinion for a meer Legend, maintaining that the Deposition of *Childeric* was perform'd by the Sole Authority

thority of the State of the *Franks*. See here what *Papebrocius* writes to prove that it is not improbable, that Pope *Zachary* never so much as contented to this Depoſition, becauſe the whole Body of the Nation judged it juſt and neceſſary. 'For it was no new thing, ſaith he, 'for the *Franks*, when they had diſpatcht any of their 'Kings or thruſt them into Monaſteries, to ſubſtitute o-'thers in their Room, ſuch as were indeed of the *Mero-'vingian* Line, yet not always thoſe that were the next 'Heirs in a right Line of Succeſſion; as is evident to any 'one, that reads the Hiſtory of *Gregory* of *Tours*, ſtuft with 'Royal Tragedies and Revolutions, wherewith the Popes 'never concern'd themſelves, or enquir'd into the Right 'and Title of thoſe in Poſſeſſion of the Throne, by what 'means ſoever they got to it. And when ever did the 'Patriarchs of *Conſtantinople* refuſe to crown, or the *Ro-'man* Biſhops to own thoſe Emperours, which Fortune 'any way ſoever offer'd to them? For ſeeing none of 'the Biſhops, nor of the Abbots, nor any of thoſe Per-'ſons, who at that time were accounted famous for their 'Learning and Sanctity, did oppoſe the Elevation of 'King *Pippin*, if Pope *Zachary* had undertaken to op-'poſe it, his oppoſition would have been to no pur-'poſe againſt ſuch an unanimus Reſolution of the 'whole Kingdom, already executed; and to which no-'thing was wanting ſave onely the Ceremony of the 'Sacred Unction or Coronation. The reaſon of my al-ledging *Papebrocius* that famous Compiler of the Laws of the Saints, is onely to let you ſee, how true the matter I have here advanced is, *viz.* That the Church never at any time refuſed to pray for thoſe, who have been owned by the Body of the State, and that the Chriſtians in all Ages have been infinitely e-ſtrang'd from that Maxim; whereon ſome Men do now build the Schiſme we deplore, *viz.* That it be-

'longs

longs to the Church to Judge who is the Lawful Soveraign, and that she can and may consider him as an Usurper, who is owned by the State, and that its Members ought to refuse to pray for him, and to separate themselves from those, who do; as from Persons that openly Violate the Laws of God, and the Obligations of Conscience; which I heartily wish these Gentlemen may take into their Serious Consideration.

I am,

FINIS.